

**REMARKS**

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-6 and 12-13 remain for examination.

**Rejections Under § 112**

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The examiner has objected to the use of the term "one pair of oppositely disposed apertures" for Claims 1, 2 and 5, and the term "tapered so as to be smaller than a non-end portion" in Claim 12.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Again, the examiner questions the terminology and the limitation "an end portion of at least one of the array substrate and opposing substrate being polished and tapered so as to be smaller than a non-end portion".

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy of the telephone interview conducted on April 30, 2003, in connection with the above application. During this telephone interview, the Section 112 rejection set forth above was discussed.

As pointed out during the interview, support for the oppositely disposed apertures in Claims 1, 2 and 5 is readily seen in reference to Applicant's Figure 3 in which the apertures and aperture seals are positioned across the top, sides and bottom of the array substrate and are positioned opposite one another across horizontal and vertical lines through the substrate. Thus, Figure 3 provides clear support for such limitations.

With regard to the tapered limitation, the Examiner's attention is directed toward Figures 4 and 5 in which the tapering is clearly shown. As discussed during the interview, the terminology "peripheral" and "non-peripheral" portions of the array would apparently present a clearer recitation of the subject matter claimed and Applicant has adopted this latter terminology.

It is submitted that Applicant's claims are in full compliance with the provisions of the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Kazias (5,919,606) in view of Hirakata (6,219,127). The examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The rejections set forth in the current Office Action are essentially the same as those presented in the prior Office Action. As such, Applicant incorporates by reference the remarks previously set forth in reply to the prior Office Action and as filed in the Amendment mailed January 21, 2003.

As discussed during the interview, and in connection with the Examiner's "Response to Arguments" on page 7 of the outstanding Office Action, Kazlas does not disclose sealants for the peripheral apertures. There may be some confusion in that there are in fact two different seals, one for the individual liquid crystal cells 940 (see Kazlas Figure 9), and another as the outer peripheral seal 920. Applicant likewise has two seals and the claim limitations recite that the outer seal contains oppositely disposed apertures sealed by a hole sealant. Kazlas does not disclose such a hole sealant for the outer peripheral seal 920. The edge seals referred to in Column 11, Line 20 and again in Column 11, Line 29, are the edge seals for the individual liquid crystal cells 940 as is clear from the dimensional limitations set forth in Column 5 as tabulated in Figure 10. Clearly the cell sealants are different than the outer or peripheral seal 920. Kazlas is completely silent about any hole sealant for the outer peripheral seal and indeed, Figure 9 shows no such sealants.

In order to expedite further prosecution of the Application, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 5 to include the taper limitation that also appears in Claim 12. Thus, in addition to the sealant distinction pointed out above, Applicant's claims recite the tapered limitations which are not disclosed in the prior art. Indeed, the taper of Ishihara is exactly opposite to that of Applicant's.

In view of the comments set forth above and the amendments made hereto to Applicant's independent claims, it is submitted that Applicant's independent claims are

patentable over the prior art. Moreover, Applicant's dependent claims depend directly or indirectly upon the independent claims from which they depend and are likewise deemed allowable at least for the same reasons applicable for the independent claims.

It is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a prima facie case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103 and thus, that that the Application should be allowed.

The Application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 25, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5109  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,257